

REMARKS

Claims 17-52 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-16 were previously canceled. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 17, 18, 20, 26, 27, 32, 33, 35, 41, 42, 46, 47 and 50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,526,407, hereinafter “Russell”) in view of Yamamoto, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,355,338, hereinafter “Yamamoto”); and claims 19, 21-25, 28-31, 34, 36-40, 43-45, 48, 49 and 52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell and Yamamoto, in view of other prior art. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 17 recites, “(a) receiving an analog audio signal *played at an increased speed* ... (b) converting the analog audio signal *played at an increased speed* into a digital audio signal [and] (c) storing the audio information data of the digital audio signal as information data blocks and the signal pause duration data of the digital audio signal as signal pause data blocks having different time durations in a memory, wherein the audio information data and the signal pause duration data represent outputs at *a normal speaking speed*.”

The Office Action states that “Russell did not explicitly disclose that the analog audio signal is played at an increased speed, and that the audio information data and the signal pause duration data of the resulted digital audio signal represent outputs at a normal speaking speed.” (Office Action, page 4.) Applicant agrees. The Office Action, however, states:

Yamamoto disclosed a method for fast transfer of audio from source tape (i.e. analog signal) to digital disc (i.e. digital signal) by though time-axis compressed recording, which involves setting the source tape to a driving speed up to 32 times the normal speed, implying that the signal received by the analog to digital converter 9 in Fig. 2 is played at an increased speed. Yamamoto further disclosed that the data reproduced on the digital disc is at normal speaking speed via using the Time Axis Modifying Memory (Yamamoto, Fig. 2).

(Office Action, page 4.) Yamamoto does not teach or suggest receiving an analog audio signal *played at an increased speed* and converting the analog audio signal *played at an increased speed* into a digital audio signal. Rather Yamamoto discloses digitizing an analog source tape 2 via A-D converter 9 into first and second time axis modifying memories 11a and 11b. (See Yamamoto, Figure 2; column 2, lines 62-68; column 3, lines 1-27.) Yamamoto does not teach setting the source tape to a driving speed up to 32 times greater than normal speed, as suggested by the Examiner. (See Office Action, page 4.) Rather, Yamamoto teaches using time axis modifying memories 11a and 11b to effect compress the time axis. (Yamamoto, Figure 2.) Yamamoto does not teach or suggest that the source tape, itself, is ran faster than normal speed. Applicant further notes that Yamamoto teaches recording the *slave* table 32 times faster than normal speed, and not the *source* tape. (See Yamamoto, column 4, lines 25-28.)

Applicant further notes that because first and second time axis modifying memories 11a and 11b compress the time axis, the data recorded on disc recorder 13 is on a compressed time axis and not at normal speaking speed, as suggested by the Office Action. (See Yamamoto, Figure 2; See Office Action, page 4.)

Russell and Yamamoto, therefore, do not teach or suggest the claim limitations of receiving an analog audio signal *played at an increased speed*, converting the analog audio signal *played at an increased speed* into a digital audio signal and storing the audio information data, wherein the audio information data and the signal pause duration data represent outputs at a *normal speaking speed*. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 18-31 depend from claim 17 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 32 recites:

(a) receiving an analog audio signal played *at an increased speed* ... (b) converting the analog audio signal played *at an increased speed* into digital audio data [and] (c) storing the converted digital audio data, such that the converted digital audio data represents an output *at a normal speaking speed*.

The Office Action states that Russell does not "disclose that the analog audio signal is played at an increased speed, and that the audio information data and the signal pause duration data of the resulted digital audio signal represent outputs at a normal speaking speed." (Office Action, page 7.) The Office Action suggests combining Yamamoto with Russell to teach receiving an analog audio signal played *at an increased speed* and that the converted digital audio data represents an output *at a normal speaking speed*. (Office Action, page 7.) As discussed with respect to claim 17, hereinabove, Yamamoto does not teach or suggest running source tape 2 at an increased speed, nor does Yamamoto teach that converted digital audio data represents an output *at a normal speaking speed*. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 32 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 33-46 depend from claim 32 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 47 recites:

receiving an analog audio signal played at an increased speed and containing audio information and signal pauses; converting the analog audio signal played at an increased speed into digital audio data having audio information data and signal pause duration data [and] storing the audio information data as information

data blocks in a memory, wherein the audio information data represents an output at a normal speaking speed.

The Office Action rejected claim 47 on the same basis of claim 32. As discussed with respect to claim 17, hereinabove, Yamamoto does not teach or suggest running source tape 2 at an increased speed, nor does Yamamoto teach that converted digital audio data represents an output *at a normal speaking speed*. Russell and Yamamoto, therefore, cannot teach or suggest the limitations of claim 47. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 47 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 48 and 49 depend from claim 47 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Benjamin E. Nise, Applicant's attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge, or credit any overpayment, Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

September 9, 2009

Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218



Benjamin E. Nise
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 55,500